



Winston-A  
Smith/R4/USEPA/US  
02/26/2005 12:18 PM

To: Carol Monell/R4/USEPA/US@EPA  
cc  
bcc

Subject: Re: Dunne Briefing on Phosphates

You don't have to burn bridges. At this point, anything is possible, depending on Dunne. But we are persuaded by what we think will be Florida's position (still waiting to hear from Sole about pilot vs. all residential), and Mike Cook's as well...

-----Carol Monell/R4/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Winston-A Smith/R4/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: Carol Monell/R4/USEPA/US  
Date: 02/26/2005 11:22AM  
Subject: Re: Dunne Briefing on Phosphates

Makes sense - if I can work on this during the FL trip hopefully we'll have enough time to do a couple of dry runs.

I've got to figure out how to deal with the HQ technical and community relations people that we met with. The HQ tech person was waiting for a write-up of the project Friday to start getting feedback on. The Community folks are not expecting a pilot. I don't want to burn bridges with them by showing up Thursday with what will be perceived by them to be something very different than they understood and agreed to earlier. I didn't call Stuart back late Friday (HQ rad guy). I'll figure it out....

-----  
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----

From: Winston-A Smith  
Sent: 02/26/2005 10:38 AM  
To: Carol Monell  
Subject: Dunne Briefing on Phosphates

Carol, in thinking about the upcoming briefing I have an idea of how to present what we have, and let Tom make decisions about direction. Here is how I think we should do this:

1. Present the overall picture of contamination and history of these sites. Include the extent of probable contamination and risk, including the disparate views. We need to spend some time on the risk issue. Also need to explain how some view this as Public Health issue, not CERCLA concern. Don't forget this was Dick Green's opinion, also.
2. Go over data we have from FL. Then present our plan for assessment, including CERCLA sites and housing on unclaimed previously mined land. At this time, we need to be very candid about Florida's concerns regarding public perceptions and industry reaction, regarding both as a PRP and from a financial standpoint (what can industry afford). Make the point of why we are not (unless Tom feels otherwise) flying the entirety of the homes.
3. Then we should go into the remediation issue. How it has been handled in other areas and what it would cost to do the same process in Florida (include some assumptions of houses needing remediation).
4. Suggest the development of a Florida-specific approach, based on the situation as it exists, (perhaps acknowledging an element of "Public Health" that might mitigate what CERCLA is responsible for).



10799445